DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 456 IR 009 312

AUTHOR Brodeur, Doris; Heinich, Robert
TITLE Report of the Third Annual Survey of the Circulation of Nonprint Educational Media in Public Schools, 1979-1980.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Audio-Visual Center.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 54p.; For related document, see ED 190 061.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiovisual Aids; Disabilities; *Educational Media; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Materials; *Learning Disabilities; *Library Circulation; Library Services; *Media Selection; Media Specialists; Nonprint Media; *Public Schools; School Surveys

ABSTRACT

The third of a series on the circulation of nonprint educational media by media centers at district, county, and regional levels, this report is primarily concerned with the distribution of nonprint materials for handicapped learners, and the selection and evaluation methods used by media directors in building collections of materials that are available to teachers and learners. The study focuses on procedures for the identification and selection of nonprint educational media for circulation to public schools, and examines the extent to which nonprint materials for handicapped learners are included in the system of distribution. A profile of 16mm films, videotapes, and filmstrip set collections is provided. Funding sources, user requests, accessibility to materials, and profiles of the professional orientations of media directors surveyed are also given. (Author/MER)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED202456

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPORT OF THE THIRD ANNUAL SURVEY OF THE CIRCULATION OF NONPRINT EDUCATIONAL MEDIA IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1979-1980

A Report Prepared by

Doris Brodeur

Robert Heinich

in conjunction with the

Handicapped Learner Materials Distribution Center
Audio-Visual Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Heinich

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR009312

REPORT OF THE THIRD ANNUAL SURVEY OF THE CIRCULATION OF NONPRINT EDUCATIONAL MEDIA IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1979-1980

A report prepared by
Doris Brodeur
Robert Heinich

in conjunction with the
Handicapped Learner Materials Distribution Center (HLMDC)
Audio-Visual Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Objectives

This study is part of an on-going investigation of the availability and circulation of nonprint educational media in public schools. It focuses on media centers at district, county, and regional levels that circulate collections of 16mm film, videotape, and other nonprint media. Previous studies, in the series, have examined such issues as booking practices, censorship concerns, and cataloging practices. This year's main concerns are the distribution of nonprint handicapped learner materials and the selection and evaluation procedures used by media directors in building the collections of materials that are available to teachers and learners.

Until recently, teachers who worked with handicapped learners were, for the most part, trained Special Education teachers. Most of these teachers are aware of special materials for handicapped learners and are familiar with some of the networks of Special Education Resource Centers from which materials may be obtained. Since the introduction of P.L. 94-142, Education of all Handicapped

Children, handicapped learners have been mainstreamed into regular classrooms. All teachers, including those not specifically trained in Special Education, are seeking materials to use with handicapped learners.

Since district, county, and regional media centers provide some of the nonprint instructional materials for teachers, it was thought important to examine whether these centers provide nonprint materials to teachers for use with handicapped learners as well. The study examines the procedures for the selection of nonprint educational media for circulation to public schools and hopes to determine the extent to which nonprint materials for handicapped learners are included in the system of distribution.

Finally, we looked at the people who responded to the questionnaire. We asked them about their training, experience, professional identity, and job priorities. While we used the term "media director" throughout, it must be remembered that not all respondents are head of their respective agencies. The larger the agency, the more likely the respondent is not the director but, rather, the individual in charge of selection.

We are still being plagued by the reporting of unreliable data. If a study such as this is to have any meaning, it must be based on accurate data. This study is not a one shot deal. We are trying to build a series of studies that will provide valuable information to the professionals who work in the field and those who study the field. Neither comparisons over time nor trends can be determined reliably unless each year's data are accurate.

Sample

The population of this study is district and regional media directors who circulate collections of nonprint educational media to public schools in the United States. A stratified purposive sample of these directors was chosen by geographical distribution across the United States, as indicated by Postal Zip Code, and by size and type of agency within each geographical area.

Table 1. Breakdown of Respondents by ADA and Type of Agency

(N = 141)

ADA	0 9,999	10,000 19,999	20,000 39,999	40,000 64,999	65,000 99,999	100,000 249,999	250,000 +	Total	% of Sample
School District	23	19	11	9	4	4	2	72	51.4%
County	3	5	4	4	2	4	1	23[a]	16.4%
Regional	0	8	11	5	7	11	3	45	32.1%
Total	26	32	26	18	13	19	6	140	
% of Sample	18.6%	22.9%	18.6%	12.9%	9.3%	13.6%	4.3%		100%

[a]It was not possible to determine the size (ADA) of one county agency. There are 24 county agencies in the sample.

The size of the agency was determined by the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) figure of the schools served by the agency. The numbers, ranging from about 500 to over 1,000,000, were classified into seven size categories. The type of agency is classified either as a school district, serving schools under one administrative unit, a county, serving more than one district within a geographical county, or a regional, serving more than one district in more than one county. It should be noted that included in the total of regional agencies are two state agencies, and one agency that is a part of a State Department of Education network.

Respondents are fairly evenly distributed geographically by zip code, ranging from 8 in zip code 3 to 18 in zip codes 0 and 6. Forty-one states are represented, with the number of agencies in each state ranging from 1 to 9.

Table 2. Breakdown of Respondents by State
(N = 141)

Zipcode 0	MA	5	
	RI	1	
	NH	2	
	ME	2	
	CT	3	
	NJ	5	
			18
1	NY	7	
	PA	7	
			14
2	MD	3	
	VA	5	
	WV	1	
	NC	4	
	SC	3	
			16
3	GA	1	
	FL	4	
	AL	2	
	TN	1	
			8
4	OH	9	
	IN	7	
	MI	5	
			21
Zipcode 5	IA	2	
	WI	2	
	MN	3	
	SD	1	
	MT	1	
			9
6	IL	9	
	MO	3	
	KS	3	
	NE	3	
			18
7	LA	4	
	OK	1	
	TX	6	
			11
8	CO	1	
	ID	2	
	UT	1	
	AZ	2	
	NM	3	
	NV	1	
			10
9	CA	9	
	OR	3	
	WA	4	
			16

PROFILE OF THE MEDIA AGENCIES

Schools and Institutions Served

The school district, county, and regional media centers included in this study circulate nonprint educational media to the public schools in their areas. Table 3 shows the average number of public schools served and the most frequently reported grade pattern of the schools at each level. As in previous studies,

categories of public schools are defined differently by different respondents. For example, twenty different grade patterns were reported for elementary schools, varying from K-1 to K-8. The most frequently reported grade pattern is included in Table 3.

Table 3. Average Number of Public Schools Served

Public School	District (N=72)	County (N=24)	Regional (N=45)	Most frequently reported grade pattern
Elementary	44.3	96.6	141.1	K-6
Middle	7.0	11.3	12.2	6-8
Junior High	8.2	9.1	23.5	7-9
Jr./Sr. Combination	2.7	3.0	10.6	7-12
Senior High	7.1	18.5	33.9	9-12
Area Vocational	2.1	2.2	5.9	--
Community College	1.7	6.5	5.9	--

Some agencies circulate nonprint media to a few private schools on an informal basis. Materials purchased with ESEA Title IV-B funds may be shared, or the circulation of the materials may be limited to personal pick-up only, or a participation fee may be charged. Besides public and private schools, other institutions are served by the media agencies. Special Education Centers, both public and private, were named by 40 respondents. The institutions which use nonprint media from the responding agencies are grouped into a few general categories.

Table 4. Other Institutions Served--Public and Private

(number of agencies reporting the institution)

Public Special Education Centers	35
Colleges, universities	13
Alternate schools, special programs	11
Local government and community agencies	7
Nursery schools	5
Hospitals	3
Juvenile centers	3
Adult education	3
Division of Forestry (state parks)	3
Prisons	1
Local school board	1
Veterans	1
Television stations	1
Public libraries	1
Private Special Education Centers	5
Juvenile centers	3
Colleges, universities	2
Community service groups	2
Nursery schools	2
Prisons	1
Church groups	1

Profile of the Collections

The study asked for information about materials in three media formats: 16mm film, videotape, and filmstrip kits. Not all media agencies collect and circulate the same kind of materials, but, if they distribute any nonprint materials at all, they circulate 16mm film. All responding agencies in this study circulate 16mm film. Because of the anticipated trend toward video formats, information was collected about videotape. In recent years, trends have indicated that smaller format materials, like filmstrip kits, may be becoming building-level acquisitions and it may be less likely that they are circulated from district, county, or regional agencies.

Table 5. Profile of Collections -- 16mm film (means)

	Agency	0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	Combined	n*
Prints	District	904.1	1,289.5	2,481.5	5,203.7	5,895.5	10,713.0	50,303.0	3,908.2	72
	County[a]	4,933.3	1,876.4	3,394.7	5,970.0	4,020.7	13,229.3	37,028.0	6,555.3	26
	Regional[b]	2,433.0	2,402.9	2,997.5	3,323.4	6,836.3	7,463.7	14,092.0	5,107.4	56
Titles	District	870.1	1,170.9	2,043.6	2,952.0	4,187.3	5,966.7	7,010.5	2,005.1	72
	County	2,260.0	1,635.2	2,839.7	3,897.5	3,875.3	3,637.8	5,820.0	3,060.8	26
	Regional	2,000.0	1,804.8	2,437.6	2,349.1	3,765.3	3,446.3	6,085.0	2,923.3	56
Largest Number of Prints per Title	District	2.2	3.5	3.9	9.0	8.8	20.7	33.0	5.8	69
	County	6.0	3.4	4.0	7.8	6.0	31.0	50.0	10.8	22
	Regional	--	2.5	4.3	5.2	10.1	12.1	16.0	7.7	45
Bookings	District	3,840.0	8,382.8	20,576.5	28,983.9	34,309.3	80,414.3	230,000.0	24,482.9	67
	County	45,821.3[c]	14,516.6	20,874.5	77,522.0	50,513.0	240,000.0	80,307.0	76,500.3	23
	Regional	--	11,941.0	100,000.0	31,366.0	89,557.8	74,859.4	100,000.0	68,241.5	40
Requests	District	4,109.9	10,070.0	25,459.1	38,509.1	38,247.3	360,000.0	370,000.0	50,753.8	52
	County	41,160.0	15,416.6	22,310.3	88,030.5	60,377.5	96,330.5	100,000.0	55,928.6	22
	Regional	--	14,434.2	31,357.3	40,375.0	100,000.0	98,835.1	160,000.0	67,512.3	35
Booking/Request Ratio	District	.93	.95	.90	.73	.89	.46	.63	.86	
	County	c	.95	.94	.91	.83	c	.82	c	
	Regional	--	.87	4.62	.78	.84	.82	.67	1.79	
Print per Title Ratio	District	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.8	7.2	1.9	
	County	2.2	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.0	3.6	6.4	2.1	
	Regional	--	1.3	1.2	1.5	1.8	2.2	2.3	1.7	
Request/Elem. School Ratio	District	409.4	624.5	663.7	697.6	541.1	3,471.2	838.0	757.4	
	County	608.3	513.2	551.2	1,188.7	697.5	852.9	133.1	720.5	
	Regional	--	363.3	3,833.3	652.0	699.0	369.2	410.4	1,293.1	

Table 5 (continued)

	Agency	0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	Combined	n*
Print/Elementary School Ration	District	95.7	78.5	72.7	76.2	75.3	94.8	111.0	84.0	66
	County	90.1	72.7	69.8	82.0	36.5	122.9	47.1	80.6	21
	Regional	--	76.8	245.9	49.2	57.4	26.3	40.7	95.7	39
New Titles in 1978-1979	District	35.6	73.1	198.0	100.0	119.8	343.0	141.0	99.0	63
	County	514.5	159.0	118.5	234.8	120.0	109.5	144.0	185.7	21
	Regional	--	62.2	158.7	141.8	367.0	158.3	415.7	193.0	40

a-One agency is reporting statistics for the elementary library only.
b-There were no Regional agencies in the 0-9,999 ADA category.
c-Data not reliable.
*-Number of responses to item.

Film. Several respondents indicated that for the number of bookings and the number of requests, information is more difficult to obtain. They commented that no record is available, or, if figures are provided, that they are estimates. In a few cases, the number of bookings and requests includes the total for all media formats--not just 16mm film.

Videotape. Ninety-two agencies (65%) circulate videotapes. The blank spaces in Table 6 indicate that there were no agencies in these categories which reported having any videotapes to circulate. In some agencies, videotape masters are duplicated for the schools, but collections of videotapes are not circulated.

Table 6. Profile of Collections -- Videotape (means)

		ADA 0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	Combined	n[a]
Prints	District	276.6	252.1	466.6	216.0	1,616.7	--	1,100.0	425.4	39
	County	106.0	10.0	1.509.0	47.0	--	192.3	--	391.1	11
	Regional	--	86.7	335.7	215.3	317.0	252.3	88.0	259.6	28
Titles	District	276.6	227.1	465.1	140.0	909.3	--	100.0	320.8	36
	County	106.0	10.0	1,259.0	46.5	--	187.7	--	339.6	10
	Regional	--	78.3	321.4	159.8	317.0	245.6	8.0	241.9	26
Bookings	District	1,396.7	844.8	1,441.5	75,992.3	2,615.3	--	20.0	11,580.2	29
	County	3.0	15.0	10.0	59.0	--	571.0	--	184.0	7
	Regional	--	241.5	1,622.8	438.0	279.0	325.5	2,508.0	952.5	15
Requests	District	1,927.0	1,063.7	164.0	--	2,753.7	--	20.0	1,427.2	18
	County	5.0	15.0	10.0	69.5	--	817.0	--	257.6	7
	Regional	--	481.0	1,229.5	--	460.0	432.0	2,508.0	1,106.5	11
Largest Number of Prints Per Title	District	1.0	2.4	1.3	4.3	16.7	--	--	3.6	28
	County	1.0	1.0	14.0	1.5	--	1.7	--	4.2	9
	Regional	--	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	3.5	1.6	19
New Titles in 1978-1979	District	40.3	17.9	79.0	5.0	155.0	--	15.0	48.5	24
	County	200.0	5.0	--	5.0	--	163.0	--	93.3	4
	Regional	--	--	146.4	9.0	88.5	82.8	500.5	150.6	15

a-Small n in each item indicates there are not many agencies with videotape collections.

A little more than half of the agencies which circulate videotape (55%) have moved or are moving toward the adoption of a single videotape format. Decisions are about evenly divided between 1/2" VHS (42%) and 3/4" U-matic (44%), with a few (5%) opting for both formats. The remaining format decisions include 1/2" reel-to-reel and 1/2" Sony. Some respondents indicated that they are still in the discussion process and are awaiting the development of videodisc.

Agencies which circulate videotape materials obtain their programs from a variety of sources. Table 7 indicates the count and percent based on the ninety-two agencies who are presently circulating videotape.

Table 7. Sources of Videotape Programs
(N = 92)

	Count	%
Recordings of 16mm films under a licensing agreement	30	33%
Purchased or leased from commercial distributors	51	55%
Purchased or leased from non-profit distributors	44	48%
Rented from a commercial or non-commercial agency	5	5%
Broadcast by commercial stations	13	14%
Broadcast by public stations	53	58%
Local productions	55	60%

Notes: The breakdowns by size and type of agency are not significant, except for local production. Districts tend to tape local productions more than county or regional agencies.

Filmstrip sets. Although the number of responses for collections of filmstrip sets seems to indicate a fair amount of activity in these media, agencies' later responses in the study indicate that 57 agencies (40%) no longer acquire filmstrip sets to circulate to schools.

Table 8. Profile of Collections--Filmstrip Sets (means)

	Agency	0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	Combined	n[a]
Prints (copies)	District	2,960.5	2,216.2	1,821.2	15,616.9	912.5	2,168		4,287.7	46
	County	3,100	154	601.3	561		100		953	10
	Regional		1,204	462	105	1,241.8	277.2	1,243.5	673.9	24
Titles	District	690.5	1,863	1,490.4	2,465.7	687.5	121		1,456.1	43
	County	1,800	145.5	518	495		80		651.5	10
	Regional		1,768.5	391.9	100	1,226.3	331.5	1,105.5	665.7	24
Bookings	District	1,023.5	2,926.9	4,999.2	b	1,198	14,015		b	42
	County	8,000	95	5,138	2,210				3,503.1	8
	Regional		8,000	2,414.2	62	307.3	859.8	1,692.5	1,742.4	16
Requests	District	1,482.3	4,194.3	4,713.8	b	2,356	103		6,463.3[b]	27
	County	7,500	95	5,538.3	2,312				3,616.1	8
	Regional			2,734		87.5	1,662.7	2,028	1,842.1	11
Largest number of copies for title	District	3	3.5	2.8	4	4.5	6.5		3.5	41
	County	3	4	3	2.5		1		3.1	9
	Regional		1	1.2		3.3	3.5	6.5	2.7	15
New titles in 1978-1979	District	88.6	60.8	121.4	118.3	50			87.9	33
	County	90	4	118.5	13				63.9	7
	Regional			57	83	34.5	2		40.9	8

a-Small n's indicate very few agencies continuing to circulate collections of filmstrip sets.
b-Coding error possible.

Of the 141 district, county, and regional agencies who participated in this study, 100% circulate collections of 16mm film, 65% circulate videotape, and 60% circulate filmstrip sets.

Funding for Nonprint Media

Respondents were asked to state the amount of money that had been budgeted for nonprint materials in FY 1978-1979, and to indicate the amount received from the local tax base, from fees charged to clients, from state revenues and from federal sources. For some, the figures are difficult to obtain, because all money is from a general fund and sources are not separated or identified, or because print and nonprint budgets are combined.

Table 9. Budget and Sources of Funds (Means)[a]

		0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	Combined	n
District N = 72	Total non-print budget	$31,272.09	$40,706.56	$40,953.10	73,094.25	140,000	170,000	$860,000	$81,010	66
	Local tax base	$18,255.60	25,742.46	29,718.25	110,000	76,000	180,000		46,401.51	47
	Fees				627				627	1
	State	$73,294.67	19,507.56	17,924.25	14,825.67	94,500		50,000	34,119.36	22
	Federal	$14,249.27	5,570	27,020.17	34,080.20	100,000	79,055	230,000	35,526.49	39
County N = 24	Total non-print budget	$110,000	$27,056.25	$34,832.75	180,000	$49,412.50	100,000	$400,000	100,000	20
	Local tax base	$97,320		23,000	130,000		11,740	80,800	81,245	8
	Fees	$8,000	23,302.67	39,568	62,522.67	49,412.50	17,610		38,420.58	12
	State		9,452.67	21,000	130,000		81,536.67	280,000	78,835.33	9
	Federal	$18,900	4,980	11,500	13,000		17,587.50	40,400	15,603.89	9
Regional N = 45	Total non-print budget		$15,701.71	$48,889	$70,107.60	140,000	$140,000	$200,000	$93,728.52	42
	Local tax base		24,423.60	40,553.50		210,000	93,620	220,000	80,645.86	14
	Fees		7,500	38,197.22	43,252.67	170,000	140,000	9,611	81,611.58	24
	State		8,000	6,000	50,000	27,600	62,546.67	100,000	47,765.33	15
	Federal		7,400	2,845	49,888.67	58,000	74,000		31,820.50	12
	Total non-print budget Combined	$38,004.42	$32,201.56	$43,465.64	$98,977.06	130,261.92	144,893.88	$458,617.67	$88,392.28	
	(n)	24	27	25	17	13	16	6	128	

a Blanks indicate that agencies in these categories did not report funds from these sources.

Fees

Single-district agencies do not generally charge fees to clients for use of their nonprint materials. Only one district agency, in this study, reported collecting any fees. Of the multi-district agencies, 82% of the county and 78% of the regional agencies charge fees for services. The basis of these fees is either an annual per pupil charge, or a rental price for the items circulated.

Table 10. Basis of Fees Charged to Clients (count and %)

Charges	District		County		Regional		Combined	
	(N = 72)		(N = 22)		(N = 45)		(N = 139)	
No fees	71	99%	4	18%	10	22%	85	61%
Annual per pupil charge			16	73%	28	62%	44	32%
Uniform rental charge					4	9%	4	3%
Varied rental charge	1	1%	2	9%			3	2%
Other[a]					3	7%	3	2%

[a] Other

Rental charge to private colleges
Base fee plus utilization
Based on weighted ADA--depends on wealth of the district.

The annual per pupil charge ranges from $ .30 to $9.67 with an average of $2.65. The rental charges range from $2.00 per item per use to $10.00 per item per day. In some cases, the charges are for non-members or private schools. One agency charges one-sixth the cost of a film per year, if the film is on a long-term deposit.

Federal Funds

Single district agencies tend to receive federal funds from various programs more than do multi-district agencies. Respondents were asked about a few of these federal programs.

Table 11: Sources of Federal Funds
(Count and % responding yes)[a]

Federal Program	District (N = 72)		County (N = 23)		Regional (N = 45)		Combined % (N = 140)	
ESEA - IVB Instructional Materials and School Library Resources	58	81%	9	39%	16	36%	83	59.3%
P.L. 94-142, Education for all Handicapped Children	16	22%	2	9%	3	7%	21	15 %
ESEA - IVC, Innovation and Support	8	11%			1	11%	9	6.4%
Environmental Education	1	1%					1	.7%
Bilingual Education	9	13%	1	4%			10	7.1%
Metric Education	2	3%					2	1.4%
Other[b]	4	6%	2	9%	1	2%	7	5.0%

[a] Percents may total more than 100 because respondents could select more than one item.

[b] Other
Nutrition Education 3
ESEA - I 2
Forest Reserve Funds--one year only.
Migrant Program
Follow Through Program

About 15% of the agencies are now receiving federal funds from P.L. 94-142, Education of All Handicapped Children. When asked if they anticipate receiving funds for P.L. 94-142 in FY 1980, 39% of the sample indicated yes. Single district agencies are more likely to anticipate funding than county or regional agencies. (District, 54%, County, 26%, Regional, 22%).

Renting and Borrowing from Other Agencies

Because budgets are limited, district, county, and regional agencies may be unable to acquire all the nonprint materials that are desired by their clients. Respondents were asked if they ever rent or borrow materials from other agencies or organizations.

Table 12. Rent or Borrow Materials From Other Agencies
(count and % responding yes)

	RENT				BORROW			
	District (N=70)	County (N=23)	Regional (N=43)	Combined (N=135)	District (N=70)	County (N=23)	Regional (N=42)	Combined (N=134)
16mm film	42 61%	6 26%	3 7%	51 38%	50 73%	8 35%	12 29%	70 52%
Videotape	16 23%	2 9%	1 2%	19 14%	27 39%	5 24%	5 13%	37 28%
Filmstrip sets	5 7%	1 5%		6 5%	21 30%	4 19%	2 5%	27 21%

District agencies tend to rent and borrow nonprint materials more than county or regional agencies, and they tend to rent and borrow 16mm film more than videotape and filmstrip sets. In examining the breakdown by the size of the agency (table not included), smaller agencies tend to rent and borrow 16mm film more than do larger agencies.

Renting and Borrowing from Other Agencies

Respondents were asked, in particular, about borrowing or renting materials for handicapped learners. When asked if they depend on other agencies for materials for handicapped learners, 45% said yes. Those who do not, mentioned that most of the "providing" is done directly to the user without going through the agency.

The responding agencies rent or borrow materials from a variety of places.

Table 13. Agencies Which Provide Handicapped Materials (number of times reported)

Regional Special Education Resource Center (14)

State Department of Special Education (1)

State Department Agencies (A-V, film library, etc.) (17)

Regional Media Centers (5)

General Categories
- Local, public and film libraries (4)
- Hospitals and public health agencies (3)
- Universities (2)
- Dairy Council
- Department of Human Resources
- Clearinghouses

Specific Agencies
- Bell Telephone Company
- American Cancer Society
- General Motors
- Library of Congress Network
- U.S. Government Materials
- U.S. Office of Education
- Captioned Films for the Deaf (5)
- Printing House for the Blind (3)
- Perkins Institute
- Handicapped Learner Materials Distribution Center

In obtaining materials for handicapped learners in the future, media agencies

are more likely to purchase materials than they are to rent or borrow them. The trends for renting and borrowing are similar to those reported above for all non-print materials: it tends to be single district agencies and it tends to be smaller agencies that will be renting or borrowing materials.

Requests for Materials

Media agencies have received a surprisingly large number of requests for materials for handicapped learners. This is an area of concern that needs further investigation. More than half the respondents indicated they have received more than 25 requests, and from this question, it is not possible to determine what is the actual volume of requests. Many agencies do not keep separate records or have no way of determining just how many requests are received.

Table 14. Number of Requests for Handicapped Learner Materials

	0-9,999 (N=24)	10,000-19,999 (N=32)	20,000-39,999 (N=24)	40,000-64,999 (N=16)	65,000-99,999 (N=13)	100,000-249,999 (N=18)	250,000+ (N=7)	Combined (N=134)
No way of knowing		3 9%	1 4%	1 6%	2 15%	6 33%		13 10%
0 requests	4 17%	2 6%	2 8%	1 6%	1 8%	2 11%	1 14%	13 10%
0-10 requests	8 33%	7 22%	3 13%	1 6%		1 6%		20 15%
10-25 requests	4 17%	7 22%	1 4%		1 8%	3 17%		16 12%
25+ requests	8 33%	13 41%	17 71%	13 81%	9 69%	6 33%	6 86%	72 54%

Note: Breakdown by type of agency is not significant.

In two agencies, all the requests are for Captioned Films for the Deaf. Several agencies do not handle these requests but refer them to the Special Education network.

The requests for handicapped learner materials come mostly from Special Education personnel (77%) or from classroom teachers (64%).

Table 15. Source of Requests for Handicapped Learner Materials

	0-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		None or Unknown	
Classroom teachers	28	21%	23	17%	19	14%	14	11%	48	36%
Special Ed. personnel	16	12%	28	21%	26	20%	32	24%	31	23%
Bldg. media prof.	24	19%	11	9%	2	2%	3	2%	90	69%
Parents	20	16%							109	84%
Other[a]	9	7%					1	1%	118	92%

[a] Other
Administrators - 0-25% (1)
Agencies - 0-25% (2)

Locating Nonprint Materials

For the most part, media agencies use the same methods to locate, evaluate, and select nonprint media for handicapped learners as they do for all other nonprint media. More than half the respondents (54%) contact the Special Education personnel to help them locate materials and many report using Special Education information sources. This question needs further clarification and investigation because a later item suggests that very few respondents are aware of such information sources as NICSEM, NIMIS, CEC, and HLMDC.

Table 16. Methods to Locate Nonprint Materials for Handicapped Learners (N=139)

Methods	Yes	
	Count	%[a]
Use same methods as for other materials	98	70%
Use Special Education information sources	60	43%
Contact Special Education personnel for information	75	54%
No attempts to locate yet	19	14%
Other[b]	11	8%

[a] Percent total is greater than 100 because respondents could select more than one item.

[b] Other

We have a separate Special Education IMC. (3)
We contract with a regional SEIMC.
We have few requests other than for Captioned Films.
The county center locates materials.
We develop our own.
By computer--long range plan.
We use catalogs from HLMDC--Indiana University.
In 1980-81, we will be using NICSEM.
U.S. Office of Education.

Criteria for Evaluating Handicapped Learner Materials

Very few agencies have special criteria for evaluating handicapped learner materials. Even those who reported "yes" described very general criteria by which they evaluate all materials. Some respondents described procedures more than criteria. A further study could examine this issue to try to determine what criteria are used and by whom, how and where the criteria are developed, and how Special Education personnel work with media directors to locate and select non-print media.

SELECTION OF NONPRINT MEDIA

Media directors in district, county, and regional media centers are the channels through which information about nonprint media, and the nonprint media themselves often pass in going from the marketplace to the classroom. Media producers and distributors offer an abundance of instructional materials, of which only a small fraction ever reach the classroom. Media directors, charged with the task of evaluating and selecting nonprint instructional media, are largely responsible for the specific media which are eventually available for distribution to public schools.

The policies and procedures of evaluating and selecting nonprint educational media vary from one media agency to the next. This study examines the variety of procedures and approaches to the selection task, and identifies certain factors which account for some of the variance in the procedures.

Purpose of the Collection

If the procedures involved in selecting nonprint media vary, it is not because the basic objectives are different. Almost 100% of the respondents reported that the purpose of the nonprint media collection is to meet teachers' instructional needs in the classroom. A second major purpose is to provide materials for teacher training and in-service programs. For these purposes, media directors have found it is not difficult to find suitable materials.

Table 17. Purpose of the Nonprint Media Collection
(N=139)

It is a Purpose		Purpose	Ease/Difficulty of Locating Materials for That Purpose: Easy		Moderately Easy		Moderately Difficult		Difficult	
138	99%	For teachers to use in classrooms	83	60%	45	32%	10	7%		
78	56%	For students self-instruction	28	20%	33	24%	13	9%	4	3%
36	26%	For students out of class	7	5%	9	7%	14	10%	6	4%
116	83%	For teacher training/in-service	34	25%	51	37%	20	14%	11	8%
102	73%	For teachers to use with handicapped	26	19%	36	26%	28	20%	12	9%
56	40%	For handicapped learners in and out of class	9	7%	12	9%	24	17%	11	8%
32	23%	For parents of handicapped learners	4	3%	7	5%	9	7%	12	9%
8	6%	Other[a]	4	3%	3	2%	1	1%		

[a] Other
For non-school groups (2)
For support services, e.g. school bus driver training, cafeteria worker training, volunteer ambulance corps workers (3)
Supervisors of teachers
For government agencies, community groups, institutions, citizens
For student use in the media center
For special programs, e.g. Bilingual Education, Native American Education

A majority of media directors (73%) also have as an objective to provide nonprint materials for teachers to use with handicapped learners. They perceive the task of locating suitable materials to be slightly more difficult for this purpose. Although student and parent use of media out of class is not a high priority objective, a few respondents (6%) did report that they select materials for some non-school groups.

Identification of Needs

One of the first steps in the process of providing materials and services in any organization is the identification and assessment of needs. Media directors were asked what methods they use to identify the need for new titles. Respondents gave highest priority to examining the circulation and use statistics. They felt it important to check whether there were sufficient prints to satisfy circulation demands. Next came ways of meeting teacher needs and desires, followed by methods to determine specific curricular demands. Only a small number of respondents compare their collections with standards established by the media field.

Table 18. Identification of Needs

Method[a]	Number of Respondents Who Use this Method	Combined 1st, 2nd, 3rd Choice[b]
Keep track of unfilled requests to determine need for duplicates	68%	46%
Check circulation statistics	72%	43%
Ask about teacher satisfaction	72%	39%
Seek suggestions from teachers of specific titles or subject areas	59%	42%
Notified of curricular revisions	50%	22%
Depend on Media Committees as liaisons with teachers	46%	30%
Participate in curriculum planning meetings	44%	20%
Check the number of titles in collection in each subject/grade area	43%	16%
Compare with Media Programs: District and School	12%	4%

[a] Methods are ordered from highest priority to lowest, based on a median score.

[b] Each item could have been 1st through 9th choice, or not chosen at all.

Respondents offered other examples of methods used to assess needs: compare with other county collections, anticipate needs when a new title is acquired on an extremely interesting subject, take recommendations from film companies as to what are the most highly rated films in other counties and districts.

Participation in Curriculum Planning

According to Table 18, about half the respondents are notified of curricular revisions and innovations and about 44% participate in some way in curriculum planning meetings. Respondents were asked more specifically to identify the nature of their participation. They were presented with three hypothetical situations[a] and asked to select the item(s) which described their involvement. Participation may vary because of the specific situations chosen, but overall the responses give an indication of how respondents perceived their role in curriculum planning.

Table 19. Participation in Curriculum Planning
(N=132)

Level of Involvement	Situation 1	Situation 2	Situation 3
Initiates the action by suggesting revisions, innovations, materials	15 12%	83 63%	37 28%
Is invited to attend curriculum planning sessions	57 44%	67 51%	42 32%
Is notified of curriculum plans and asked to select nonprint materials	75 57%	51 39%	62 47%
Is notified of curriculum plans through newsletters	15 12%	29 22%	40 30%
Becomes aware through requests for new materials from schools	52 40%	87 66%	56 42%

SITUATION 1: Suppose the Social Studies Committee were planning a revision of the Social Studies curriculum in your district/region. How would the revisions come to your attention?

SITUATION 2: Suppose your district/region were deciding to initiate a new program in career education. You are aware of films and other large-scale multimedia kits on the market that could be the basis for implementing such a program. How would you be involved in the plans to implement the program in your district/region?

SITUATION 3: As a result of P.L. 94-142, Education for all Handicapped Children Act, school districts are adopting programs to mainstream handicapped learners into the classroom. If your district/region were planning a special program to comply with these mandated changes, how would the decisions come to your attention?

Identification of Materials

Once the needs are assessed, the main task becomes one of locating suitable nonprint media to meet those needs. Media directors rely on a variety of sources for information on new materials. Producers' catalogs, mail advertisements, and sales representatives are most often the sources by which media directors first become aware of new titles--both for 16mm film and filmstrip sets. The order of frequency of use of other sources is only slightly different for 16mm film and filmstrip sets.

Table 20. First Awareness of New Materials--16mm Film
(N=135)

Source[a]	Median	Mode
Producers' catalogs	3.7	4
Mail advertisements	3.7	4
Sales representatives	3.4	4
Colleagues	2.3	2
Serial publications	2.2	2
Teachers or clients	2.2	2
Exhibits at conferences	2.1	2
Professional organizations	1.9	2
Information service agencies	1.8	2

0 = Never[b]
1 = Rarely
2 = Sometimes
3 = Often
4 = Very often

First Awareness of New Materials--Filmstrip Sets
(N=80)[c]

Source	Median	Mode
Producers' catalogs	3.7	4
Mail advertisements	3.6	4
Sales representatives	3.1	4
Serial publications	2.3	2
Exhibits at conferences	2.2	2
Colleagues	2.2	2
Teachers or clients	2.2	2
Professional organizations	1.8	2
Information service agencies	1.7	1

0 = Never
1 = Rarely
2 = Sometimes
3 = Often
4 = Very often

[a] Ordered by frequency of use of source--from most to least.

[b] 'Never'--was not a choice. Respondents wrote it in.

[c] 56 agencies do not circulate filmstrip sets.

Media directors may use some of these information sources often to very often to learn about new materials, but they do not rely solely on that information when making the decision to purchase new titles. With the same information sources and the same rating scale, the median scores ranged from 1.7 to 1.2, indicating that media directors rarely rely solely on the information from sales representatives, catalogs, publications and mail advertisements to make their purchase decisions.

Standard Reference and Serial Publications

According to Table 20, media directors use serial publications only infrequently for first awareness of new materials. With so many publications available, it may be useful to know which specific periodicals are used at all by media directors. Respondents were asked to indicate whether the publications are more helpful for notices of new titles, for review and evaluation of new titles, or for retrospective searches.

Table 21. Standard Reference and Serial Publications
(N=139)

Publication	Never Read	Those who read it, read for: Notices of New Films	Reviews	Retrospective Searches
American Film Festival Guide	82%	11%	6%	7%[a]
Audio-Visual Communications	68%	13%	14%	6%
Audio-Visual Instruction	37%	28%	24%	12%
The Booklist	60%	17%	31%	8%
CINE - Golden Eagle Film Awards	75%	19%	5%	2%
Educational Film Locator	73%	6%	5%	19%
EPIE Report	65%	6%	20%	9%
Educational Screen & AV Guide	91%	5%	5%	
Educators' Guide to Free Materials	66%	14%	7%	18%
Feature Films on 8mm and 16mm	86%	4%	1%	9%
Film Library Quarterly	92%	3%	4%	3%
Film News	82%	10%	12%	2%
Film Review Digest	94%	2%	5%	3%
Guide to Government-Loan Films	76%	12%	3%	9%
Landers' Film Reviews	78%	7%	17%	7%
Library of Congress Catalogs	91%	4%		6%
Library Journal	76%	12%	15%	5%
Media and Methods	20%	46%	48%	12%
Media Review Digest	81%	7%	14%	5%
NICEM Indexes	51%	20%	7%	38%
NICSEM Indexes	91%	2%	1%	5%
Previews	40%	18%	47%	8%
School Media Quarterly	79%	7%	12%	2%
School Library Journal	65%	15%	23%	3%
School Product News	53%	32%	9%	7%
Sight Lines	81%	8%	13%	3%

[a] Percents do not total 100 because respondents chose more than one category, or else did not specify use.

In addition, respondents were asked to indicate what other journals or publications they read regularly for more general information and ideas that are helpful to them in their work.

Table 22. Journals
(N=137)

Journal	Count	%	Journal	Count	%
American Education	26	19%	Instructor	40	29%
American School Board J	41	30%	J. of Sp. Ed. Technology	2	1%
Arithmetic Teacher	13	7%	Journal of Teacher Ed.	5	4%
Change	3	2%	Language Arts	13	9%
Crisis	-	-	Learning	23	17%
Education Unlimited	3	2%	NSPI Journal	-	-
ECTJ	58	42%	Phi Delta Kappan	56	40%
Educational Leadership	34	25%	Reading Teacher	17	12%
Educational Technology	46	33%	Science Teacher	11	8%
English Journal	23	17%	Social Education	5	4%
Exceptional Children	12	9%	Teacher	23	17%
Gifted Child Quarterly	12	9%	Teaching Excep. Children	7	5%
History Teacher	2	1%	Today's Education	37	27%

Respondents also wrote in titles of another 35 publications. In this list, Educational and Industrial TV was named six times.

Information Service Agencies

Information Service Agencies was used as a general term to include such organizations as Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE). According to Table 20, media directors rarely use these services to find out about new material. Further questioning indicates, however, that media directors are aware of some of these services and have used them for other reasons.

Table 23. Information Service Agencies

Agency[b]	Are Aware of: Count	%	n	Have used: Count	%	n	Primary Source of Information about Agency (% of those who are aware)[a] Agency Itself	Inservice Training	Colleagues	Profess'l Literature	Meetings/ Conference	Teachers/ Clients
ERIC	126	94%	134	84	70%	120	30%	7%	6%	21%	9%	1%
NICEM	118	90%	131	83	72%	115	58%	4%	4%	22%	2%	
EPIE	113	86%	131	85	72%	118	59%	5%	7%	10%	4%	
EFLA	94	71%	132	47	41%	116	53%	5%	5%	21%	5%	
NIMIS	27	21%	129	10	8%	122	22%	22%	17%	22%	9%	
NICSEM	45	35%	129	17	14%	119	45%	7%	12%	12%	1%	2%
CEC	26	20%	131	11	9%	124		14%	24%	10%	5%	19%
HLMDC	9	7%	130	4	3%	126	43%	14%	14%		14%	14%

[a] Percents do not equal 100 because respondents checked more than one source.

[b] ERIC - Educational Resources Information Center

NICEM - National Information Center for Educational Media

EPIE - Educational Products Information Exchange

EFLA - Educational Film Library Association

NIMIS - National Instructional Materials Information System

NICSEM - National Information Center for Special Education Materials

CEC - Council for Exceptional Children

HLMDC - Handicapped Learner Materials Distribution Center

Preview Requests

Respondents were asked who initiated the requests to preview film in their media agencies. Most often, it is the media director, himself/herself, who initiates requests, followed by teachers, subject supervisors, building media professionals, in-house staff and curriculum directors. Principals rarely initiate requests.

In deciding what specific films to bring in for preview, media directors find that certain kinds of information about the new titles would be very helpful.

Table 24. Kind of Information Desired Before Preview

	Essential	Helpful	Not Necessary
Curriculum use or unit	75%	21%	4%
Grade level	65%	31%	3%
Running time	33%	73%	13%
Color or black and white	38%	49%	13%
Price	50%	39%	10%
Synopsis of content	85%	13%	2%
Media format	82%	16%	2%
Producer or distributor	51%	34%	16%
Copyright date	64%	31%	5%
What reviewers say	14%	72%	14%
Awards it has won	9%	57%	34%
Results of validation studies	13%	59%	29%
What teachers say	38%	51%	11%

Evaluation of Nonprint Media

Screening and evaluation of new materials is an important part of the selection process in all media agencies. Sometimes, nonprint media are evaluated by the media director alone, sometimes by teachers in classrooms, sometimes by committees of teachers and subject specialists, and only rarely by parents and community members. When it comes time to make the final purchase decision, media directors

rely on the recommendations of these evaluators. They rely most on the evaluation of teachers who were recommended by subject supervisors and department heads. There is little difference in the rankings of the importance of evaluations for 16mm film and for filmstrip sets.

Table 25. Importance of Recommendations--16mm film

Evaluator(s)[a]	Median	Mode
Teachers recommended by department heads, supervisors, etc.	3.6	4
Teachers who volunteer	3.6	4
Persons specifically contacted by media agency	3.6	4
Media committees	3.3	4
Media director	3.1	3
In-house staff	2.9	3
Students	2.8	3
Parents/community groups	2.1	2

1 = Unimportant
2 = Somewhat important
3 = Important
4 = Extremely Important

Importance of Recommendations--Filmstrip Sets

Evaluator(s)[a]	Median	Mode
Teachers recommended by department heads, supervisors, etc.	3.7	4
Teachers who volunteer	3.6	4
Persons specifically contacted by media agency	3.5	4
Media committees	3.4	4
In-house staff	3.1	3
Media director	3.0	3
Students	2.7	3
Parents/community groups	2.2	2

1 = Unimportant
2 = Somewhat important
3 = Important
4 = Extremely important

[a] Ordered in decreasing importance

[b] Other
Instructional supervisors
Subject specialists
Executive director
Curriculum committees

Priorities

Seldom are media directors in a position to be able to purchase all the non-print media titles that are needed or that are recommended by the evaluators. Selection of specific titles is done according to a set of priorities, sometimes explicit, sometimes not. The highest priority is given to materials which fill a gap in the collection in terms of subject area and grade level.

Table 26. Priorities

Priority[a]	Percent who consider this	Combined 1st, 2nd, 3rd choice[b]
Gap in the collection in terms of subject/grade	93%	80%
Number of requests from teachers	92%	61%
Estimate of use	83%	48%
Up-coming curriculum need	79%	48%
Replacement or duplicate title	80%	35%
Price	72%	11%
Bonus or discount	58%	5%
Availability from other collections	51%	8%
Artistic excellence	38%	2%

[a] Ordered from high to low, indicated by median score.

[b] Items could have been 1st through 9th choice, or not chosen at all.

Respondents wrote in other priorities as well: grant funding restrictions, multiple uses of the film, completing series that have been successful, and special needs.

Accounting for Decisions

Media directors, for the most part, are accountable for their purchase decisions. They keep track of their decisions, however, for different reasons. The most important reason reported is the desire to satisfy specific needs that arise from curriculum planning and revision, followed closely by the desire to maintain balanced collections.

Table 27. Accounting for Purchase Decisions
(N=135)

Reason	% choosing item	Combined 1st, 2nd, 3rd choice
To satisfy specific needs of curriculum planning	71%	64%
To maintain balanced collection in terms of subject/grade	71%	65%
To inform teachers of decisions on their requests	70%	50%
To justify expenses to supervisors	57%	37%
To demonstrate high use in order to maintain/increase budget	59%	36%

Other

To balance with the accounting department.

To build a large film collection.

To answer possible questions dealing with censorship concerns.

To keep from duplicating orders.

To demonstrate teacher participation in evaluating materials.

PROFILE OF THE MEDIA DIRECTOR

Educational Background

Media directors were asked to indicate the kind of degree and the areas of specialization (majors) of their undergraduate and graduate programs. Of the 154 who responded to the question, the majority (58%)have attained Master's degrees (Table 28). The distribution of educational level ranges from 2 with no degree to 15 with doctoral degrees. It should be noted that all respondents in this study are called media directors though their official titles vary. In a few media centers, the respondent to the questionnaire may not be the head of the agency. This is a possible explanation for the two respondents who reported having no baccalaureate degrees.

Table 28. Level of Education of Media Directors (N=154)

Educational level	No. attaining this level	% attaining this level
No baccalaureate degree [a]	2	1%
B.A. or B.S.	5	3%
Bachelor's +	7	5%
M.A., M.Ed., M.S., or M.L.S.	90	58%
Master's +	18	12%
Specialist of Sixth Year	17	11%
Ed.D. or Ph.D.	15	10%

[a]May represent an Associate degree.

The areas of specialization that were written in by the respondents were classified into five areas: education, library science, administration, audio-visual media, and curriculum (Table 29).

Table 29. Areas of Specialization of Media Directors (N=156)

Major area	No. with the major	% with the major
Education	75	48%
Audiovisual media	71	46%
Administration	45	29%
Library science	33	21%
Curriculum	15	10%

Note. A number of media directors listed majors in more than one area.

A major in education included all levels: early childhood, elementary, secondary, higher education, and special education. An administration major was either business administration or educational administration. Media administration was classified with an audiovisual media major. Media directors very frequently majored in different areas in their undergraduate and graduate degree programs. They also majored in areas other than the five accounted for, but that information was not considered relevant to this study. A larger number of respondents had specialized in education (48%) or audiovisual media (46%) than in any other areas. Very few media directors (10%) specialized in curriculum. No one area of specialization is common to more than 50% of the group.

Job Experience

Media directors were asked to list the job positions they have held, the major duty associated with each position, and the number of years spent in each position (Table 30). Positions were classified into the same five categories that were used for the areas of specialization: education, library science, administration, audiovisual media and curriculum. Education included mainly classroom teaching experience. Library science included school and public

library positions. Administration included educational administration at all levels of schooling, supervision of special programs, and business administration. Audiovisual media covered a wide range of functions including administration, consultation, and production of media. Curriculum included coordination of elementary and secondary curricula, as well as supervision of specific subject areas within school settings. Experience in other areas was not considered necessary data for this study.

As expected, nearly all media directors (92%) reported some job experience in audiovisual media. The few who did not reported that they were either filling in temporarily or that their positions covered such a wide range of duties that they did not consider audiovisual media to be a major concern. Excluding audiovisual media, classroom teaching is a common job experience for more than half the respondents (65%). Very few media directors (8) had been curriculum coordinators or subject supervisors.

Table 30. Job Experiences of the Media Directors (N=156)

Area of job experience	With experience		Years of experience		
	No.	%	Minimum	Maximum	Mean[a]
Audiovisual media	143	92%	1	32	12.6
Education	101	65%	1	22	7.3
Library science	44	28%	1	34	8.6
Administration	41	26%	1	33	9.7
Curriculum	8	5%	2	23	8.3

[a]Mean is calculated on the number of respondents who have at least 1 year experience

It was assumed that there is a high correlation between the educational background of media directors and their job experience. T-tests were performed to detect the differences in the mean number of years experience between those who majored in a specific area and those who did not. None of the t-tests proved to be statistically significant, however.

Professional Organizations

Media directors were asked to indicate the professional organizations to which they belonged by checking a list of nine options: AASA, ALA, AECT, ASCD, NAEB, NSPI, a subject matter association, a state educational media group, and other (Table 31). The full titles of the organizations were not listed because it was assumed that if the respondents were members, they would recognize the letters.

Table 31. Membership in Professional Organizations (N=156)

Professional organization	No. who belong	% who belong
A state educational media group	132	85%
Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)	110	71%
American Library Association (ALA)	35	22%
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)	35	22%
American Association of School Administrators (AASA)	9	6%
National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB)	8	5%
A subject matter association	7	5%
National Society for Performance and Instruction (NSPI)	-	—

The option "Other" resulted in an extensive list of national, state and local organizations. Many media directors retaliated by providing lists of organizations identified by initials only! Phi Delta Kappa (PDK) was listed by 10% of the respondents. The total number of memberships held by individual respondents ranged from 0 to 9 with a mean of 3.2. The modal response, however, was 2. The measures of central tendency were calculated on the number of organizations checked from the given list and under "Other".

Professional Orientations of Media Directors

Media directors were asked to rank three separate lists of nine items. They were to select only those items that were relevant to their situations. They were then to rank only those items that they selected. For each item, rankings of 1, 2, or 3 were grouped together as high; 4, 5, and 6 were called medium; 7, 8, and 9 were called low. Medians were calculated to be able to rank order the choices based on the number who chose the item. The medians are to be interpreted with caution however, because not all respondents made the same number of choices. The same procedure was followed for all questions using this form of response.

The first question asked them to rank a series of seminar topics that they might suggest to a colleague who had recently accepted a position similar to their own (Table 32). "Management Strategies" and "Media and Curriculum Development" were the top-ranked choices of the majority of respondents. In fact, "Management Strategies" was the first choice of 53% of the group. The next three topics, "Designing a Learning Resource Center", "Using Computers to Administer Learning Resource Programs", and "Cataloguing Nonprint Materials", were chosen by more than half the respondents, but the rankings are split between high and medium. Two topics, "Microcomputers in Instructional Design",

and "Consulting Skills for Instructional Designers", were chosen by about half the respondents, but they are ranked as top choices by only about 20%. The last two topics, "Information Sources for Special Education Resources", and "Library Networking" were relevant to only about one third of the group. This last item was no one's first choice. The total number of items checked by individual respondents ranged from 1 to 9 with a mean of 5.2.

The topics were designed to reflect administrative, curricular, and library orientations. There were three topics for each orientation. It was thought that the rankings would group together the items of the same orientation. From the percent of respondents who chose each item, it can be noted that of the first four topics, three are administrative in nature: "Management Strategies", "Designing a Learning Resource Center", "Using Computers to Administer Learning Resource Programs". The curriculum-oriented topics, except for "Media and Curriculum Development", were more middle choices. The library-oriented topics, except for "Cataloguing of Nonprint Materials", were the choices of the smallest number of respondents.

The second was a question asking media directors to rank order groups of professionals with whom they most closely identify. Of the nine groups, three were administrators, three were curriculum and instruction professionals, and three were librarians. The items did not separate out into three distinct groups.

More than half the respondents chose to identify with seven of the nine groups. Not surprisingly, 87% indicated that audiovisual administrators were among their top choices. (This item was ranked number one by 67% of the respondents.) What is surprising is that there are even 6% who did not choose the item at all. School librarians and curriculum specialists were indicated by almost three-fourths of the respondents, and nearly half ranked these groups in the high category.

Table 32. Seminar Topics Recommended By Media Directors (N=158)

Topic of seminar	% whose ranking was High	Medium	Low	% who chose item[a]	Median[b]
Management Strategies	80%	9%	-	90%	1.4
Media and Curriculum Development	68%	19%	-	86%	2.4
Designing a Learning Resource Center	31%	33%	3%	67%	5.0
Using Computers to Administer Learning Resource Programs	26%	24%	10%	59%	6.7
Cataloguing Nonprint Materials	25%	19%	9%	52%	8.9
Microcomputers in Instructional Design	15%	26%	9%	50%	9.5
Consulting Skills for Instructional Designers	21%	17%	4%	42%	9.6
Information Sources for Special Education Resources	8%	16%	13%	38%	9.7
Library Networking	13%	15%	8%	35%	9.7

[a] Differences in total percents are due to rounding.

[b] Not all respondents ranked the same number of items.

School district administrators, instructional developers, teachers, and information specialists were more middle choices. It was thought that teachers would have been ranked higher, since so many media directors have been teachers themselves. Principals and public librarians were chosen by the fewest number of respondents. The total number of items checked by individual respondents ranged from 1 to 9 with a mean of 5.7.

Table 33. Professionals With Whom Media Directors Identify (N=158)

Professional Group	% whose rankings were			% who chose item[a]	Median[b]
	High	Medium	Low		
Audiovisual Administrators	87%	5%	1%	94%	1.2
School Librarians	47%	31%	3%	80%	3.8
Curriculum Specialists	44%	28%	4%	75%	4.0
School District Administrators	33%	24%	7%	63%	5.3
Instructional Developers	32%	22%	6%	59%	5.9
Teachers	24%	29%	11%	63%	6.1
Information Specialists	17%	28%	9%	53%	8.2
Principals	13%	20%	13%	45%	9.6
Public Librarians	2%	7%	18%	30%	9.8

[a]Differences in total percents are due to rounding.

[b]Not all respondents ranked the same number of items.

The third question asked media directors to check, from a list of nine activities, those that they perceived were important as part of their major job responsibilities. They were then asked to rank order the activities they checked (Table 34). Media directors individually made more choices in this question

than they did in the previous two. The total number of items checked ranged from 2 to 9 with a mean of 7.3.

The items were designed to represent administrative, curricular, and library orientations. The items of any one orientation did not cluster toward the top, middle, or bottom of the list. What is interesting in these data is that more than 60% of the respondents chose each of the activities.

Table 34. Activities Perceived As Important By Media Directors (N=158)

Activities	% whose ranking was			% who chose item[a]	Median[b]
	High	Medium	Low		
Selecting and distributing materials	78%	15%	2%	94%	1.8
Developing and coordinating the materials budget	68%	20%	5%	93%	2.4
Training teachers in the use of materials	37%	29%	8%	75%	4.8
Promoting the media program	32%	40%	16%	87%	4.9
Organizing/revising the media catalogs	23%	37%	27%	87%	5.7
Planning for space and facilities	17%	41%	23%	80%	5.8
Cataloguing nonprint materials	14%	34%	27%	74%	6.8
Consulting in the planning of curriculum	24%	24%	15%	62%	6.8
Planning the implementation of innovative programs	20%	21%	24%	64%	7.6

[a]Differences in total percents are due to rounding.

[b]Not all respondents ranked the same number of times.

It was hypothesized that media directors have different perceptions of their roles. If these three questions are indicators of role perceptions, the hypothesis is supported. In selecting seminar topics, media directors leaned more toward administrative functions, but in the identification with professionals, and in the activities perceived as important, no one orientation emerged as a characteristic of the whole group. The significance of this information lies in the fact that if media directors do indeed perceive their roles differently, these perceptual biases will influence the way buying decisions are made.

It was thought that perceptual biases are shaped to a certain extent by educational background and experience. Media directors who were educated as administrators might perceive activities relating to budget planning as more important than, for example, cataloguing nonprint media. Cross tabulations were performed for each educational major with each of the activities listed in Table 34. Chi-square tests and ordinal measures of association were applied (Table 35). The effects are difficult to interpret because although the Chi-square tests are significant, the gammas[5] are very low. However, certain patterns of behavior can be detected.

Media directors with backgrounds in library science are not likely to perceive the training of teachers as one of their most important activities. One-fourth did not select the item and those who did rated it only medium in importance. They do, however, find that promoting the media program through newsletters and public relations is an important activity. On the other hand, directors with majors in curriculum do rate the training of teachers as an important activity. The number of respondents in

---

[5]Gamma is a measure of association suitable for ordinal data. The values are slightly higher than tau. Gamma may be compared with other correlation coefficients.

Table 35. Effects of Educational Major on the Perceived Importance of Activities (N=150)

Educational major	Activity	% whose ranking was				X^2	Y
		High	Medium	Low	Not Ranked		
Library Science	Training teachers	21%	52%	3%	24%	10.65**	.21
	Promoting media programs	52%	24%	18%	6%	8.0*	.31
Administration	Coordinating the budget	55%	38%	5%	3%	9.55*	.21
	Consulting on curriculum	43%	17%	10%	31%	9.2*	.28
Audiovisual Media	Training teachers	41%	32%	15%	13%	8.5*	.16
	Cataloguing nonprint media	13%	35%	36%	16%	8.31*	.12
	Planning facilities	9%	52%	29%	10%	18.7**	.02
	Planning innovative programs	20%	25%	32%	23%	8.37*	.18
Curriculum	Training teachers	47%	53%	-	-	8.17*	.42

Note. Only those relationships with significant Chi-square tests are listed

*p .05

**p .01

this category is small, but they all rated the item as high or medium in importance.

As expected, respondents with backgrounds in administration perceived the planning and coordination of the budget as important. Ninety-three percent ranked that activity high or medium. These same respondents are split, however, in their perceptions of consulting in curriculum planning. About a third do not perceive it to be an important activity at all, but another 43% ranked it high in importance.

Media directors with education and training in audiovisual media perceived the training of teachers to be important. Nearly three-fourths ranked this activity as high or medium. They generally did not rate as important the cataloguing of nonprint media and the planning of innovative programs. Planning facilities was ranked medium by more than half.

It should be noted that each activity was ranked in importance in relation to every other activity. To say that media directors ranked an activity as low means only that, forced to assign ranks, they considered the activity to be less important than others. A few respondents commented that it was difficult to rank the activities because all are important. The effect of job experience on the perceived importance of activities was significant in only one relationship. The more job experience respondents had in media-related positions, the higher they ranked activities relating to the budget.